

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 5-18 are pending in this application. All of the pending claims are rejected. Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 are currently amended. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 first and second paragraphs based on the limitation "multi-IP packet threads." That limitation is now removed from the claims.

Claims 1-3 and 5-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on US 5,357,617 (Davis) in view of US 2002/0002667 (Kelsey) and further in view of US 6,754,701 (Kessner). Davis and Kelsey describe general multi-thread processing. However, Applicant has already described multi-thread processing in the Background at page 2, lines 1-12. The novelty of the presently claimed invention is not multi-thread processing itself, which is well known, but rather dividing the task of routing a packet into multiple independently-executable threads and utilizing multiple pipelines, at least some of which are specialized, to process those threads such that delay in processing of a first packet routing thread in a first pipeline does not affect processing of a second packet routing thread in a second pipeline. The claims are currently amended to clarify these distinguishing features. It should be noted however that these clarifying amendments are not necessary to distinguish the cited references, and Applicant does not disclaim any subject matter by way of the current amendments to the claims. However, the current claim language more closely resembles the language of the abstract and specification.

Kessner describes use of a thread to support multiple network connections for server load testing. As described at column 2, lines 1-6:

The invention involves the use of a virtual user control flow, which is preferably a thread, that handles multiple concurrent connections to the server system during the load testing process. The use of such virtual user threads significantly reduces the number of concurrent threads needed to produce a desired load.

Clearly, Kessner uses the term "thread" to refer to something other than an independently executable set of instructions. Therefore, Kessner is inapplicable and irrelevant. It should also be noted that none of the cited references describes packet routing.

Conclusion:

Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-3 and 5-18 is requested for the reasons stated above. Claims 1 and 5 are independent claims which specifically recite the discussed limitations. Claims 2-3 and 6-18 are dependent claims which further define the invention. Should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

June 16, 2008
Date

/Holmes W. Anderson/
Holmes W. Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Anderson Gorecki & Manaras LLP
33 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-4001

Docket No. 120-100
Dd: 6/19/2008